CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

"HOW BEAUTIFUL UPON THE MOUNTAINS, ARE THE FEET OF HIM THAT BRINGETH GOOD TIDINGS, THAT PUBLISHETH PEACE."—Isa. lii, 7.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT NO. 2 CHATHAM-SQUARE, BY P. PRICE, AT $2 PER ANNUM IN ADVANCE.

VOL. II. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1833. NO. 48.

Original.

THE DESPAIRER:

A TALE—FOUNDED ON FACT.

(Concluded from our last.)

As I walked homeward, ruminating in my mind the causes which must have produced these despondent feelings, I asked myself, Is not *this* man a victim to the blighting, chilling influence of the notion of endless torments? I knew that he had heard its boding sound for more than twenty years. The parish clergyman was so far consistent with the Calvinistic system which he maintained, as to assure his congregation that "for nearly 6,000 years the Devil had obtained the souls of the greater part of those who had died;" and in his yearnings to secure those of his pastoral care who were deemed the subjects of the arch fiend, from "sinning away their day of grace," he had urged the duty of joining the "visible church of Christ, *even if they should go to hell at last.*"

My desponding friend never having heard, as it were, any thing but the unsatisfying message of Partialism, had imbibed the cold, misanthropic notion that God was his irreconcilable enemy, and that he was an abandoned victim to the horrors of a hell which had so often burst in peals of thunder on his ear.

After a lapse of two weeks I was again at his dwelling. I found him sitting alone in his apartment reading his Bible. He seemed no longer the maniac, but an expression of deep melancholy was in his countenance, and his appearance was like one who had "refused to be comforted." He took my hand and requested me to be seated. Casting my eye into the sacred volume I perceived that he was reading the 12th chap. of Matt. and as he closed the book he remarked, with a sigh, "how awful is the fate of the sinner, whose sins are never, *never* to be blotted from the book of God's remembrance." I asked him if he thought any in our day had committed the unpardonable sin, or the sin against the Holy Ghost? He sat for some moments wrapped in profound meditation, then answered: "There doubtless are some who are given over to *hardness of heart and blindness of mind*, who are vessels of wrath fitted to destruction, by their resistance of God's offered grace, and if they are thus given up, if the spirit has ceased to strive with them, surely they must be of the number whose sins are not to be forgiven in time or eternity."

I remarked that the saying, "neither in this world, neither in the world to come," has no allusion to the next state of existence; that Dr. A. Clarke understood the word "*world*" to signify, *age, or dispensation,* "neither in this dispensation, (i. e. the Jewish) neither in that which is to come, (i. e. the Christian.") This view of the subject is corroborated by a passage in Heb. ix, 26. "But now once in the end of the world hath he (Christ) appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." The apostle does not say that there are any *unpardonable* sins that shall *not* be forgiven or put away, but he speaks in the most unlimited sense, "*to put away sins*"—there is no reservation made, and the scripture teaches that Christ is the "Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the world;" that is, all sin, and this saying of the apostle will not appear to contradict the words of our Savior, if we give them their true meaning.—The judgment, (or *damnation* as it is called in Mark,) which was not to be remitted, extended to the death of the *body*, not the "loss of the soul" as many now teach, for if some sinners are not to be forgiven throughout eternity, it will make the promises void, that "all shall know God from the least to the greatest, and that all the nations which He has made shall come and worship before Him and glorify his name."

He heard what I had to say on this subject, together with some additional observations on the paternity of the Deity, and asked me, "*Do* you think that I may hope to get to heaven?" Oh! I can *never* forget his look, his attitude, and the manner in which he spake these words; they awakened all the sympathetic feelings of my heart. The question of Joseph, "doth my father yet live?" or that of the disciples, "Lord is it I?" was not uttered, thought I, with more *overwhelming* interest than this. Yes my friend, "God hath given to us eternal life, and that life is in his Son." If you have been distrusting the grace and goodness of your Father, do so no longer. If you have been a prodigal son and wandered astray in the paths of iniquity, *return* from feeding on husks to that "feast of fat things" spread before us in the gospel; *obey this and be happy.*

He told me "that he had been on the very brink of self-murder; that for a long time past he could see in God nothing but a consuming fire; no hope, no pardon, but remorse, endless death and distraction."

Here was a *believer* in the popular sentiment of endless torments, and here were the legitimate fruits of a "personal faith" therein.—Nearly all who profess to believe this doctrine, hold it up to the gaze of any and every one *except* their own dear *selves*. Hence, they can talk about "hell's horrors" as calmly as they peruse the monstrosities of the devoted Hindoos. *They* have escaped "an awful hell," and if we may judge from the apparent indifference with which they adjudge *others* to its untried depths, we hardly think that they have ever *really* considered *themselves* exposed to it.

We ask every candid man the question, whether, in the case before us, this doctrine produced "a *good hope*, through grace," of future happiness and reconciliation? and has not a similar view of the Deity in *other* instances produced despair of mind which has driven the ill-fated victim to self-destruction? While learned divines have labored to show the inconsistency of Universalists, in neglecting to "suspend their neck in a collar," would they not have subserved a *better* cause by opening the eyes of the blind, that they might see the ineffable beauties of the Divine character and enjoy the riches of His grace. He who confides in the mercy and goodness of his Heavenly Parent, and trusts the "grace which bringeth salvation to all," will not be led into the mazes of that hopelessness and distrust which lead to ruin. The case of our friend also exhibits an answer to this *common* question: "What is the use of preaching, if Universalism is true?" Is it of no use to point the desponding sojourner of earth to his Father and his home? Is it of no use to assure the weeping mourner and the trembling sinner that they have a "friend who sticketh closer than a brother?" Is it of no use to tell men who are wasting under the fatal disease of sin, that "there is balm in Gilead and a physician there?" Is it of no avail to teach men who are blindly pursuing happiness in the paths of *wickedness*, that to be happy, they must practice *goodness?* In fine, is it useless and vain to promulgate those principles which will secure man's obedience to the "first and great commandment, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy mind?"

Ministers of the general reconciliation, awake! put on "the breast-plate of righteousness, and the whole armor of God"—in due time ye shall reap if ye faint not. "God in Christ is reconciling the world unto Himself." "God is *love.*" This is the mighty power to be used in the "pulling down of the strong holds" of error and prejudice. This can curb the malevolent spirit and heal the jaundiced heart.

"'Tis this can chain the passions, sooth the soul,
Can snatch the dagger, and can dash the bowl
From murder's hand; can smooth the couch of care
Extract the thorns, and scatter roses there."

Friends of christian benevolence and truth, arise in your strength; you can do much towards disseminating the truth. The subject of this story we trust is now no longer despondent. He feels something of the joy which flows from the consideration that "God is our Father," and an extension of the same principles which led *him* to "trust in God who is the Savior of all," may bring others to view the sovreign of the universe as the Friend and Father of man, and help them to enter by faith into that "rest which remaineth for the people of God."

B. B. H.

Original.

STATE AND CONDITION OF THE UNIVERSALISTS AND THEIR ENEMIES.

Among the various christian denominations now in existence, perhaps none are so ignorant of their real state and condition as Universalists. To some, such a remark may appear exceptionable, but a little reflection, I think, will show that it is not far from the truth.—There have appeared Histories of our sect, and occasional Reviews. Of these I would speak in the highest terms of praise. That we have been emphatically 'working men' cannot be doubted. Much has been done, but more yet remains to be accomplished. How far we have got along, it would certainly be somewhat difficult precisely to ascertain. Universalists, as a sect, have been engaged in a kind of moral revolution. The war has been prosecuted with success, though not always with all the vigor and prudence that could have been wished.—The contest still continues, and whether it is time to cry victory or not, I leave for others better informed, and more sanguine, to determine. That our enemies have been driven from many of their strong holds, must readily be admitted; that they are determined not to give up, must be evident to all who are acquainted with their unwearied zeal and perseverance.

Our opposers, in some respects, are as ignorant as we are, respecting their real condition. True, their statistics may be more perfect; but we think they are by no means aware of the present state of their doctrine. During the

last half century, they have been engaged, not so much in *establishing*, as in *defending* and *improving* their system. When Universalism took its rise in America, their doctrine was horrid and revolting to all the best feelings of the heart. The old Divines had completely fettered the mind, and they preached and lived according to their own liking. To desert the temple was esteemed an insult to God, and to question or treat contemptuously a minister, was considered a crime of equal magnitude. A new order of things has commenced. A brighter day has dawned upon the world—a day which we fondly hope will never be succeeded by such a night of error and darkness as has pervaded christendom.

Again and again, have we called on our opposers to defend their doctrine; now we wish them to come out and tell us where they are, and how far they have got along. For one I am anxious to know the present form in which their tenets exist. Such rapid strides have been made, and such vast improvements have taken place within the *last few* years, that we hardly know where to find them. True, the doctrine of endless misery still exists, but its main pillars have been essentially weakened.—Our enemies remind us of an individual so foolish as to be continually undermining the foundation of his own dwelling, and yet imagines it to rest as securely as ever. We earnestly wish, therefore, that our opponents would publish a new system of divinity, and distinctly inform us what they at present retain, and what they have given up. This is a duty which they owe to themselves as well as to us. They are continually urging that endless damnation is a consequence of unbelief, but who knows whether he believes right or wrong in the present confused state of orthodox notions! If people believe right now, they certainly believed wrong twenty years ago.—Some points, we know are not now considered sound. Such as *infant damnation ; a material hell ; a personal devil*, ect. The old doctrine of *election* has under gone a variety of changes, and finally Arminianism has become the order of the day. The doctrines of *infinite sin, total depravity, Fallen Angels* and *endless punishment for sins of this life*, seem to be wavering. The sentiment that Jesus 'tasted death for every man' is very generally admitted. The doctrine of universal redemption must of course lead to that of universal salvation. To use the barbarous figure of a certain divine—the orthodox have now 'mounted on the fractious steed of general provision and they will ride furiously on to the barren, hopeless, desolate, plains of Universalism!!'

Univeralists have a great work to do, but there is one thing which they will have no occasion to perform. They have not got to enlarge their system. True, it needs to be well understood. New arguments and apt illustrations must be assiduously sought for. A wide field is spread out before us; a few choice flowers only have been plucked. A fair and manly investigation has so far characterized our labors. The same unwearied zeal must be continued, and should the march of improvement continue with its present rapidity, the day is not far distant when complete success will crown our exertions.

The great controversy between Universalists and the advocates of endless misery has changed its character in some respects. This has followed as a matter of course, in consequence of the change which has taken place in the sentiment of interminable suffering.—At first, it was supposed only necessary to collect a number of bold and figurative passages and set them in array before the mind, and thus call forth public prejudice. A more critical course has since been pursued. Now our opposers seem to be at their 'wits end.' What step to take next they cannot tell. If they publicly come out, they soon meet with a spirited defence from our order. If they refuse investigation, they show the weakness of their cause. If they remain entirely silent, the importance of the subject seems to condemn such a course. We feel sometimes to pity them. They seem to have eyes but see not, and ears but hear not. They are fast ruining their own cause' or to adopt the forcible language of scripture, they are bringing upon themselves 'swift destruction.'

In conclusion, we feel to rejoice that while we differ from the great world of mankind, we entertain a doctrine sufficiently extensive to embrace them all. Our enemies may send us to hell, but we cannot send them. Our views teach us to cherish and practice a better spirit. Universalism is the only doctrine now in existence that is not partial. While we have, therefore, the most excellent faith, let us make our works correspond to our belief. Let us be thankful for the glorious achievements of the past, and humbly wait for the glorious consummation of all things.

C. S.

Original.

THE CONTROVERSY.

To the Editors of the Christian Messenger.

Brethren—Being in this city, and perceiving a *part* of my letter of July 24th, to the Rev. Luther Lee, in the "Christian Advocate and Journal" of the 6th inst. and being desirous to present to the public, not only the *whole* of that letter; but also two preceeding, unpublished letters which have passed between us, forming a suitable introduction to our discussion; I herewith transmit the letters, and part of the letter in question, for publication, if you please, in your highly valued, and very useful paper.

Having received permission to publish the discussion with Mr. Lee, in the 'Magazine and Advocate,' Brs. Skinner and Grosh are respectfully requested to insert the following letters in their paper, together with what they will find from Mr. Lee and me, in the Christian Advocate and Journal of this city, of the 6th inst. as soon as shall suit their convenience.

I feel very greatful to my friend Lee, for having transmitted the main part of my letter of July 24th, to the Editors of the Christian Advocate and Journal; and I hereby acknowledge my obligations to the respected editors of that very extensively circulated paper, for the publication of that letter. While they do not pledge themselves to publish the whole series, while they reserve to themselves "the right of discontinuing both or either," whenever they think proper; they generously intimate that they may publish the whole, if "ably written, in a good spirit, and in proper language." I shall spare no pains to make my part worthy their attention, their approbation and their paper.

Yours with fraternal esteem,

Pitt Morse.

New York, Sept. 19th, 1833.

LETTER I.

TO THE REV. LUTHER LEE.

Watertown, June 13th, 1833.

Dear Sir—Having at length mutually agreed to discuss, what I consider the most important question in theology; I think we cannot introduce the subject in any more suitable way, than to express our views of the *manner* in which the controversy should be conducted. Controversy becomes injurious whenever it is conducted with intemperate zeal, and productive of violent animosity. Notwithstanding these incidental consequences, which result from human imperfection; truth and virtue have been extensively promoted amongst mankind by discussion; especially when conducted in a proper spirit. That a diversity of opinions are entertained on almost all subjects of speculation, is sufficiently obvious. That the same degree of certainty is not attainable in *moral* as in *demonstrative* reasoning, is known to every logician. That christians should imitate the mildness and candor of their Master, will be universally admitted.

Though we have been a long time in making our arrangements for a discussion, and have already had one public debate, yet I trust we have no personal animosities to gratify; and I am satisfied it will be for our reputation and comfort, as well as for the interests of truth, to treat each other fairly, to do as we would be done unto, in the important business before us.

The question we have to discuss has been definitely agreed upon, and is as follows: "*Will all men be finally holy and happy or not?*" I think we should exclude whatever has no direct bearing upon the question; otherwise the discussion will be extended beyond all reasonable bounds.

The rules of discussion which I think we ought to observe, are the following.

1. With respect to the subject in debate, we should consider each other upon an *equality*, particularly in regard to honesty.

2. We should avoid all *expressions* which have no effect upon the subject of discussion.

3. We should not indulge in any personal reflections.

4. We should not accuse each other of improper *motives*.

5. We should not charge each other with the *consequences* of any doctrine, unless those consequences be avowed by him who maintains that doctrine.

6. Contending for truth instead of victory, we should examine each others arguments with fairness, not designedly using sophistry, wit, cavilling or ridicule.

Though the strict observance of the preceding rules may require some self-command and self-discipline, yet it will facilitate our progress in the investigation of divine truth, gratify the public, who seek religious instruction, and furnish us with a joyful retrospection in after life.

Should you convince me of the correctness of your arguments, or the truth of your positions, I shall most cheerfully acknowledge it. When I think you ought to concede a position, or admit the conclusiveness of an argument, I shall inform you of it. If you should not think as I do on the subject, I shall leave it for others to decide.

As I have the affirmative of the question, I think you should answer my arguments *before* you introduce any thing in support of the negative. Having done this to the best of your capacity, prove the negative if you can. This will be logical and prevent confusion.

We admit the existence, perfections and government of an invisible Almighty Being, the Creator, Ruler and preserver of all things. We admit that God has made a revelation of his will, and of the duty and destination of man; which is contained in the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. On these acknowledged and momentous truths, we may therefore, with the utmost propriety, found our arguments.

I think we should endeavour to bring the discussion to a conclusion as soon as practicable; for I am satisfied that the public are very anxious to read the arguments of two men, whose sentiments are so widely different, who are both so confident of possessing, and being able to defend the truth, who have stood in a threatening attitude for the last eight months.

You will probably receive my answer to your last communication in the Magazine and Advocate, about the time you receive this letter.

Your views of the contents of this letter will be gladly received; and if you have any suggestions to make in relation to what you may consider the most proper manner of accomplishing our grand object, which is to elucidate truth; you will please to make them. If you have no suggestions to make, I shall receive the expression of your opinion concerning what is herein advanced, as the signal for me to commence the long expected and much desired controversy.

Yours, &c.

PITT MORSE.

LETTER II.

TO THE REV. MR. MORSE.

DEAR SIR—Your communication, containing rules to be observed in our contemplated controversy, has been received, and would have been answered before now, had not absence from home prevented. I shall propose no rules of discussion, since you have denied the necessity of any preliminaries, more than what is contained in my propositions and your acceptance, and after having yielded the point by offering to discuss the subject in any way you please. As to the rules which you have proposed, I have only to say, that I have nothing against them, as I understand them—that I am sorry that you have not given better evidence than you have that you wish to be governed by such rules, and that I hope to be as willing to observe them, or any other good rules of controversy, as yourself. I have only to repeat what I have already said, "begin and you shall receive my attention," and be assured the discussion will be published in some way, *should you refuse* to publish it. I am now in Watertown, as you will learn from the date of this letter, and expect to preach in the Methodist Chapel this evening at half past seven o'clock. Yours, &c.

LUTHER LEE.

Watertown, July 3d, 1833.

LETTER III.

TO THE REV. LUTHER LEE.

Watertown, July 24th, 1833.

DEAR SIR—Yours of the second inst. which you had the goodness to send to my house was examined immediately after my return from the counties of St. Lawrence and Franklin.

An agreement for a discussion is one thing. An opinion concerning the most proper manner of conducting it, is another and a different thing.

The general rules of controversy, which I have suggested, were not *necessary* to the proposed discussion; because we were bound by the agreement to have a discussion, whether our views were similar, or dissimilar, in regard to the best mode of conducting it. In honor and logic, we are bound to observe such rules, whether any thing had been said about them or not. While I did not consider them necessary to the *existence* of the discussion, I thought a mutual expression of our views concerning them *expedient*, as a matter of convenience, with respect to the mode of procedure. If we did not view such rules alike, each would take his own way. If we did view them alike, so much the beter. I am glad you "have nothing against" my rules; but I am very sorry you overlooked the *third* of those rules, and indulged in "personal reflection" in the very sentence in which you gave them your approbation.

Was there any need of your intimating that I might *refuse* to publish the discussion, after I had solemnly pledged myself to publish it, in case we could not agree about its publication? Was there any need of your threatening to publish should I refuse? Was there any *decorum* in that hint and assurance?

I now proceed to the discussion. "*Will all men,*" &c. [Then follows the remainder of the letter, as published in the "Christian Advocate and Journal" of Sept. 6th.]

Appended to this letter was the following Postscript.

"The following is *personal* and is independent of our discussion. On the 12th inst. Mr. W. Wood of this village, a respectable Methodist, verbally informed me that you had requested him to state to me that you wished to have a public oral debate with me in this village, if I would or if I dare; and that you requested him to inform the Universalists generally of this challenge. After all our arguments about the manner of a discussion, (the arguments are before the public,) after I have successfully contended for a *written* discussion; after you have yielded the point by allowing me to discuss in any way I please; after I have informed you that I pleased to discuss according to the agreement for writing; after I have written an introduction to the discussion mutually agreed upon; after you have approbated my general rules and declared yourself ready for the work; I consider a *challenge* from you, while the written discussion is pending, a *direct insult*, unworthy an answer, or further notice. As you knew I could not accept your challenge, without being totally inconsistent with myself, nor without relinquishing the ground I have gained in our correspondence; I can see no reason for your requesting Mr. Wood to inform the Universalists of your challenge, (and probably the Methodists also,) except to gratify your scandalous love of *vain boasting*, by enabling your partizans to say, (omitting important facts connected with the affair,) you had challenged me for an oral debate, and I dare not accept!

P. M.

Original.

And when he had thus spoken, he cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth. And he that was dead came forth, bound hand and foot with grave clothes, and his face was bound about with a napkin. Jesus saith unto them, loose him, and let him go.—John xi, 43, 44.

Of all the miracles performed by the Savior during his mission on earth perhaps the one referred to in the passage above cited, is the most remarkable, and at the same time, had a greater tendency to stamp upon the minds of the beholders, the belief of the divine character of Jesus, as well as bring immediate relief in soothing the sorrow and anguish of the weeping relatives and friends of the deceased Lazarus. The minds of the people, clouded by the grossest ignorance and superstition, evinced the most cordial dislike to the person of the blessed Savior, as well as the doctrines he promulgated. Still clinging to the rank dogmas and vitiated tenets instituted by their religious and civil rulers, whose only object was to blind and deceive, the people beheld with a degree of abhorrence the individual whose doctrines, if received and credited, could only be raised upon the ruin of the opinions and principles cherished by their progenitors, and clung to by them with the most active pertinacity; while the priests and rulers beheld in the same event, the utter dissolution of their power, and the annihilation of the chain by which the physical and intellectual faculties of mankind had been bound for long and weary years.

To a people thus ignorant, over whose benighted minds no rays of reason stole to enlighten and prepare the way for the reception of truth, it required more than the ordinary degree of intellect manifested by the mass of their fellow men, to force the conviction of certain facts—something more than oral explanations, or a just confirmity to the principles he taught, were nceessary to attract and rivet their attention and establish the belief of the divinity of his character and mission, and show the high power by which he was commissioned to perform his works of love upon the earth.

In the miracles performed by Christ, the feeding of the multitude, healing the sick, raising the dead, and turning the chrystal waters into blushing wine, &c. &c. the people had an evidence that the meek and gentle being who had spoken the word to them, was delegated by a higher power than aught on earth; that he had come to produce a better state of things, to build up a new covenant, and to "bring life and immortality to light through the gospel." The word that had been neglected, was now gladly received; the man who had been despised and spurned, was looked upon with holy awe and veneration, and the gospel he proclaimed embraced and cherished. Light dawned upon the minds of many, who believed and wondered, and went on their way rejoicing.

A fit subject is afforded the mind of the reflective reader in the perusal of that portion of the holy scriptures which relates to the death of Lazarus and the miracle of his resurrection as performed by Christ. The exit of an individual from the great stage of life is at any time matter for deep and serious consideration, and the contemplation of a human being after the extinction of that spark of vitality that late gave action to the frame, now no longer tangible, brings with it feelings of a nature beyond description—melancholy, awful, sublime! Let us, then, christian reader, for a moment carry ourselves back in imagination to the couch where the enfeebled frame of Lazarus is stretched, in the last throes of expiring nature. The pulse is almost still, the heart has nearly ceased to vibrate to the emotions of life, and the eyes have assumed the dull, fixed, and glassy hue that tells of approaching dissolution. And Mary, and Martha, and many friends, are gathered around the bed of him who is about to depart from them, to watch the heaving of the chest whence the breath of life is fast escaping. The lamp of life burns dimly—now it flickers in the socket—one last expiring blaze!—'tis gone; and they stand weeping by —— the dead!

The rights of sepulture are over; the body has been consigned to the tomb, and is fast approaching that state of decomposition in which matter is resolved into the various elements of which it is composed. And they had brought Jesus, who had been afar off, to the place where they had laid Lazarus; and the tears that are tracing their rude course down the cheeks of the Son of Man, bear evidence how much he loved the brother of Mary and Martha. The stone is rolled away from the cave, the heart of the Savior is communing with its Father, and the prayer has gone forth from the meek lips, stealing silently away, and rising like incense up to the throne of the immaculate God! The words are spoken—"Lazarus, come forth!"—and oh joy!—the bands of death are broken, the cerements of the grave are burst, and Lazarus, he that was *dead*, walks forth again to life, and the warm embrace of the affectionate ones who had mourned him as lost to them forever! The warm free wind comes gently o'er him in its freshness, his eyes are again opened upon the beautiful things of earth, and the limbs that were late confined within the narrow limits of the loathsome charnel house, move forward now, in the renewed freedom of youth.

* * * * Oh, if it were awful to gaze upon the dying or the dead, loved and cherished as they may have been—if the poor sorrowing heart was near to bursting with affliction then—how much more awful must it have been to those who were near when the dead Lazarus

was called again to life at the intercession of the benevolent Jesus, and by the power of the almighty Jehovah. Awful, indeed, but one so mixed with joy, that 'twas lost in wonder and adoration of the inimitable perfections of the "Holy one of Israel;" while the hearts that late were almost bursting with excess of affliction, now throb with gladness and delight, and break forth into songs of rejoicing and praise, to the mild and gentle Prince of Peace; and "many of the Jews which came to Mary, and had seen the things which Jesus did, believed on him."

Let not the individual, whose mind is shrouded by the vail of infidelity, sneer at the relation of miracles performed by Christ, because miracles of a like character are not performed in the present day. Let not this be a pretext to doubt the divinity of the Savior, or the authenticity of the scriptures as inspired revelations, calculated to benefit mankind by the high moral truths conveyed in them. But the rather let him contrast the characters of the ancients, their manners, their customs, ignorance, superstition, and mental and physical bondage, with the enlightened state of society at this day, and he will be fain to acknowledge, that what was necessary for the advancement of truth in the first would be considered as a derogation of the reasoning faculties, so extensively exercised by mankind in this advanced period of time.

If miracles be necessary to convince him of the existence of a GOD, let him but look upon the miraculous and stupendous works of creation, the high heavens, the sun, the moon, the stars, all occupying their respective stations in vast immensity, and performing their various revolutions in the most perfect harmony and order--the boundless ocean rolling its tumultuous billows with their crests of foam, high, even as the mountains, in awful grandeur, and magnificence. Let him look upon the earth, with its countless beauties, its budding flowers, its green fields and gently sloping meadows; vegetation smiling its sweet promise of plenty; birds singing, and even music in the very wind that blows, let him look upon these, (are they not miracles?) and his doubting heart within itself, confounded at its own insignificance.

These are the miracles upon which the sincere and candid Universalist, loves to gaze. In all of these he can perceive some evidence of the unbounded wisdom of his Heavenly Father; some manifestation of his love toward his children. He finds earth filled with blessings, and his thankful heart gives them a sweeter relish—the flowers and all spring up around him, in their beauty, and around all the creatures of his race, but to *him*, they are a sweet and cheering emblem, for they convince him of God's affectionate love and regard in the most trifling particulars. And when they fade away and die, he sees the type of his own certain decay; but in the coming spring, they will again bloom and be glad; and in this he can perceive that when the sands in his glass are run out, his soul, too, like the flowers, in the spring of the resurrection will again be reanimated, and clothed in a new robe that can never fade, and bloom and be glad, with the ransomed millions of the human family, in the gardens of heaven! J. P.

Philad. Sept. 8, 1833.

THE AMERICAN AUTUMN.

This season is proverbially beautiful and interesting. Our springs are too humid and chilly; our summers too hot and dusty; and our winters too cold and tempestuous. But autumn, that soft twilight of the waning year, is ever delightfully temperate and agreeable. Nothing can be more rich and splendid than the variegated mantles which our forests put on, after throwing off the light green drapery of summer. In this country, autumn comes not in "sober guise," or in "russet mantle clad," but, as expressed in the beautiful language of Miss Kemble, like a triumphant emperor, arrayed in "gorgeous robes of Tyrian dyes."—This is the only proper season in which one truly enjoys, in all its maturity of luxurious loveliness, an excursion into the country:

"There, the loaded fruit-trees bending,
Strew with mellow-gold the land;
Here, on high, from vines impending,
Purple clusters court the hand."

Autumn now throws her many-tinted robe over our landscapes, unequalled by the richest drapery which nature's wardrobe can furnish in any part of the world. We read of Italian skies and tropical evergreens, and often long to visit those regions where the birds have "no sorrow in their song, no winter in their year." But where can we find such an assemblage of beauties as is displayed, at this moment, in the groves and forests of our native state? Europe and Asia may be explored in vain. To them has prodigal nature given springs like Eden, summers of plenty, and winters of mildness. To the land of our nativity alone has she given autumns of unrivalled beauty, magnificence and abundance. Most of our poets have sung the charms of this season—all varying from each other, and all beautiful, like the many-tinted hues of the foliage of the groves. The pensive, sentimental, moralizing Bryant says,

"The melancholy days are come, the saddest of the year;"

but his exquisite lines are so well known, that we must resist the temptation to quote them. The blithe, jocund, bright-hearted Halleck sings a strain of quite a different tune, in describing the country at this period. Who would not know these lines to be his?

"In the autumn time,
Earth has no holier, nor no lovlier clime."

But we must not quote him either, for the same reason. This objection, however, does not apply to the delicate *morceau* of poor Brainard, which has seldom been copied, is in little repute, but which contains the true inspiration of poetry.

"'What is there sadd'ning in these autumn leaves?'
Have they that 'green and yellow melancholy,'
That the sweet poet spake of? Had he seen
Our variegated woods, when first the frost
Turns into beauty all October's charms—
When the dread fever quits us—when the storms
Of the wild equinox, with all its wet,
Has left the land, as the first deluge left it,
With a bright bow of many colors hung
Upon the forest tops—he had not sighed.
The moon stays longest for the hunter now;
The trees cast down their fruitage, and the blithe
And busy squirrel hoards his winter store;
While man enjoys the breeze that sweeps along
The bright blue sky above him, and that bends
Magnificently all the forest's pride,
Or whispers through the evergreens, and asks,
'What is there sadd'ning in the autumn leaves!'"

N. Y. Mirror.

VOYAGE OF LIFE.

Life bears us on like the stream of a mighty river. Our boat at first glides down the narrow channel, through the playful murmurings of the little brook, and the windings of its grassy border. The trees shed their blossoms over our young heads; the flowers on the brink seem to offer themselves to our young hands; we are happy in hope, and we grasp eagerly at the beauties around us; but the stream hurries on and still our hands are empty.

Our course in youth and manhood is along a wider and deeper flood, and amid objects more striking and magnificent. We are animated by the moving picture of enjoyment and industry which passes before us: we are excited by some short-lived success, or depressed and made miserable by some equally short-lived disappointment. But our energy and our dependence are both vain. The stream bears us on, and our joys and our griefs are alike left behind us; we may be shipwrecked, but we cannot anchor: our voyage may be hastened, but it cannot be delayed; whether rough or smooth, the river hastens towards its home, till the roaring of the ocean is in our ears, and the tossing of the waves is beneath our keel, and the lands lessen from our eyes, and the floods are lifted around us, and the earth loses sight of us, and we take our last leave of earth and its inhabitants, and of our further voyage there is no witness, but the Infinite and the Eternal.

And do we still take so much anxious thought for future days, when the days which have gone by have so strangely and uniformly deceived us? Can we still so set our hearts on the creatures of God, when we find by sad experience that the creator only is permanent? or shall we not rather lay aside every weight and every sin which doth most easily beset us, and think of ourselves henceforth as wayfaring persons only, who have no abiding inheritance but in the hope of a better world.—*Bishop Heber.*

THE GRAVE.

Time has a hasty step, and leaves his deepest track in the place of graves. Where the turf is thrown open—where the pit yawns deep and narrow, where the coffin lowers down, and where the returning clod throws back the dreariest sound that ever visits human ears—there O grave, is thy victory, and there, O time, thy short vision having ended, thou settest up a frail land mark to tell how far went thy path; and to tell where eternity commenced! The rolling sea that bathes earth's continents in its pearly waters, bearing no trace of ruin—no indentation for graves on its glassy surface, is yet a wide, hungry tomb, where unnumbered sons and daughters of Adam lie in their last dreamless slumber. Down, down, they sink in the green depths of the ocean caves, where grey eyed monsters of the unfathomed abyss stare in their sunless medium, to see the fresh cargoes of mortality arriving at their last destinations. The plains and mountains, and deserts are become wild and well filled places of graves.—Where is the spot where man has not bowed down under his last strong agony! Where is the dust that has not humanity incorporated with it? Where the willow or the elm that does not wave over, and cast their shadows upon the wasting—yea, the wasted remains of one who lived, moved, thought, and acted, amongst us. One who was as dear to the heart of friendship, as any of us are now, or can be.

Do you desire, said Socrates, the reputation of a good musician? The only sure way of obtaining it, is to become a good musician.—Would you desire in the same manner to be thought capable of serving your country either as a general or as a statesman? The best way in this case too, is really to acquire the art and experience of war and government, and to become really fit to be a general or a statesman. And in the same manner if you would be reckoned sober, temperate, just, and exquitable, the best way of acquiring this reputation, is to become sober, temperate, just, exquitable. If you can really render yourself amiable respectable, and the proper object of esteem, there is no fear of you not soon acquiring the love, the respect, and esteem of those you live with.

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

EDITED BY T. J. SAWYER AND P. PRICE, NEW-YORK, AND ABEL C. THOMAS, PHILADELPHIA.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1833.

RELIGIOUS SERVICES

In the Orchard-st. and Greenwich Churches, will hereafter commence at *half past ten* in the morning, *three* in the afternoon, and at *half past seven* in the evening.

LETTERS TO THE REV. DR. BROWNLEE--NO. XVIII.

Rev. and Dear Sir—

In my last I considered your exposition of several passages of scripture, alledged by you as texts whereon Universalists chiefly rely for the support of their "fatal error." A few more remain, which I will now consider. You say,

"*Again*, Universalists argue from John vi, 37, "All that the Father giveth me, shall come unto me," &c. This passage when read in connexion with John xvii, 9, proves that all men have not been given to the Son, and that our Savior was in the fullest sense, a Limitarian."

Our Savior a Limitarian! Of the school of John Calvin, no doubt. But why a Limitarian? Simply because he said, John xvii, 9, "I pray for them; [the disciples] *I pray not for the world*, but for them which thou hast given me." Convincing proof! Is it, I would ask in candor, is it any thing either improper or uncommon on special occasions for individuals to offer up special prayers? Our Savior was about leaving his disciples, his apostles. On them, depended, in a sense, the success of his gospel. Is it singular then that he should pray to some extent in an exclusive manner for them? It is what we do every day for the sick and the afflicted. We virtually say, "I pray for these; I pray not for the world, or in a universal manner." But as this passage is often referred to for the purpose of showing that our Savior was a Limitarian, you will excuse a few further remarks. Granting your exposition to be true, you will observe that we virtually charge our Savior with a gross violation of his own precepts. In Matt. v, 44, he used language like this, "But I say unto you, Love your enemies, &c.—and *pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you.*" That our Savior was "despitefully used and persecuted," is notorious even to the child, and that it was "the world," which hated and crucified him is equally notorious. Either he practiced on his own principles, or he did not. If he did, then, notwithstanding the passage you have qouted with such an air of triumph, he prayed for the world. But again Paul must be allowed a good expositor of the doctrines of Jesus. Hear him, 1 Tim. ii, 1, "I exhort, therefore, that *first of all*, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made *for all men.*" Here there is no ambiguity. And *Christians*, deserving the name, have in every age yielded to the exhortation, though too seldomly, I fear, have they been able to obey, "lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting." If you will trouble yourself to read the whole chapter in which the passage you quoted is found, you will see that the world is neither reprobated nor forgotten by our divine Master. At verses 20, 21, he says, "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word, that they all may be one; as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us, *that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.*" Thus the world after all constituted the ultimate object of his prayers. He wished the world to believe in him as the sent, the Messiah of God, for the world was his by gift, it was his to die for, and his to save. The following comments of Dr. A. Clarke, shows that the view here taken of the subject has the sanction of his name.

"*I pray not for the world.*] I am not yet come to that part of my intercession, see ver. 20. I am now wholly employed for my disciples that they may be properly qualified to preach my salvation to the ends of the earth. Jesus here imitates the high priest, the second part of whose prayer, on the day of expiation, was for the *priests*, the *sons of Aaron.*"

But you say, "All men have not been given to the Son." Turn, sir, to Ps. ii, 7, 8. "I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." In accordance with this language, Paul speaks of Christ, Heb. i, 2, as God's "Son, whom he hath appointed *heir of all things.*"—Whether these and kindred passages are deserving as much confidence as your assertion, the community may decide. I might add that the fact that Christ "tasted death for every man," a fact which nothing but scepticism itself can deny, is sufficient proof of the falsity of your declaration.

"*Again*, 1 Cor. xv, 22, is strongly urged, "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." The apostle is speaking in this chapter of the resurrection of the body, and of that only; and he here declares, that every man shall be raised from his grave—that the hour is coming, in which all that are in their graves shall hear the voice of the Son of Man. John v, 28."

Permit me here, sir, to ask you how all men die in Adam? Your Confession of Faith teachesyou to answer, They die both a "temporal and spiritual death." Must not all men, then, be made alive in Christ in the same manner, in order to justify the language of the inspired Apostle? To say that Christ shall merely restore *being* to man, a being that shall yet be but an eternity of pain, is not only to deny the more important part of his office, but is to ascribe to him a work which Satan himself might covet. Indeed, sir, I can conceive of nothing so glaringly inconsistent with the character both of the Son and the Father, as raising men from the dead merely to torment them forever! You would do well to remember that an important part of Christ's mission was to save from sin, and that without this, a resurrection from the dead, would instead of a blessing, be the direst curse Omnipotence could inflict.

You say "the apostle is speaking in this chapter of the resurrection of the body and of that only." In charity I would regard this assertion as a sin of ignorance. What! sir, does not the apostle speak of men's condition in the resurrection state? Replying to the question, "How are the dead raised up and with what body do they come?" he says, "It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power; it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body." See verses 42, 43, 44. Two facts are most clearly established in this chapter, *first*, that all men shall be raised from the dead. This you acknowledge.—*Second*, that all shall be raised alike, that is, "*in incorruption, in glory, in power, and with spiritual bodies.*" This you cannot successfully deny. Connected with this should be mentioned what the apostle affirms of Adam and Christ. See verses 45—49 inclusive. "The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy, and as is the heavenly such are they also that are heavenly." Here the apostle was most evidently speaking of the mortal and immortal states, and he adds, "And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." There is one prominent fact in relation to this subject which I challenge you to explain. In this whole chapter, which is devoted to the resurrection of the dead, Paul has not uttered a single word concerning *sin and misery* in the immortal state. Will you inform me how this happened? Ministers are not generally so forgetful. With the resurrection is commonly associated in the mind of Limitarians the idea of endless hell torments. Paul on the contrary, even when treating fully of the former, makes not the slightest allusion to the latter. Not only so, but he employs language, which must convince all unprejudiced minds that every human being shall be raised in the heavenly nature of the "last Adam," Jesus Christ, and that not only *death*, but *sin*, the sting of death, shall be utterly and forever destroyed. The xvth chap. of 1 Cor. furnishes irrefutable arguments in favor of Universalism. This you will understand whenever you come to its critical examation.

Nor was Paul alone in affirming that the resurrection state was a state of universal holiness and happiness. Even our Savior himself taught the same doctrine as clearly as language could express it.—See Luke xx, 34—36. The cavilling Sadducees, reasoning from analogy, as do many of their race still in the church, supposed themselves able to confound this divine teacher. His answer is worthy your serious consideration. "The children of this world marry, and are given marriage. But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage, neither can they die any more: *for they are equal unto the angels:* and *and* ARE THE CHILDREN OF GOD, *being the children of the resurrection.*" Here you cannot but observe that all who shall be accounted worthy of the future world by the resurrection from the dead, shall be not only immortal, but also, *equal unto the angels.*—And as if this might admit of cavil, it is added they "ARE THE CHILDREN OF GOD, *being the children of the resurrection.*" Such language possesses no ambiguity, and admits of no perversion. If you will hazard a contradiction of Jesus Christ, the honor, as the peril, is your own. Paul affirms that, "As in Adam all die, even so, in Christ shall all be made alive." This you understand as referring exclusively to the resurrection of the dead. Be it so. It contributes not one particle to the support of your cruel dogma of endless misery. For Christ also explicitly affirms that all who are raised shall be equal unto the angels, and shall be the children of God. Here then stands the doctrine of Universalism and the gates of hell cannot prevail against it.

Nor is this argument invalidated by John v, 28, to which you refer. The whole context shows conclusively that the resurrection there spoken of is not a literal resurrection. It was evidently taken from Dan. xii, 2, to the language of which it bears a striking similarity. But that the passage in Dan. does not refer to a literal resurrection is obvious from its connexion, and the references made to it by our Lord Matt. xiii, 43, and xxiv, 21. True it is said, "All that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and come forth." Yet at verse 25, we read, "The hour is coming, and *now is*, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live." Here there can be no dispute. It was not of the literal dead he spoke. The subject was con-

tinued to verse 28, and those who he had before called "the dead," are now with perfect propriety represented as "in the graves." Such phraseology was employed by the prophet in the vision of the valley of dry bones, "Behold, O my people, I will open your graves and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel." But enough, and more than enough. If our Lord has taught us that all who are raised from the dead shall be equal unto the angels and be the children of God, he cannot without contradicting himself have taught that some shall come forth in that resurrecton to damnation. Besides, I would suggest for your consideration, whether the doctrine of a resurrection from the dead is not completely neutralized, so far at least as the consolations and hopes to be drawn from it are concerned, when accompanied as at present it generally is, by the idea of ceaseless torments for one half the human race? Can such a doctrine beget within any heart a "joy unspeakable and full of glory?"

"Again, 2 Cor. v, 14, 15, "For the love of Christ constraineth us, because we thus judge, that if one died for all then were all dead," &c. That the word *all* must be understood in a limited sense appears in the passage. We rejoice that all who live not unto themselves but unto God, shall be saved."

I regret, Dr. Brownlee, that reasons were so scarce with you that you could not furnish a solitary one to support your assertion. What do you find in the passage to convince you that "the word *all* must be understood in a limited sense?" After repeated examination, I think the apostle has affirmed, first, that Christ died for all. and secondly that he died for all, that they should henceforth live not unto themselves but unto him who died and rose again in their behalf. Now if you are pleased to argue that Christ did not die for all in the unlimited sense of the word, you must bear in mind that you effectually remove the obligation resting upon all to live unto him, and leave some at liberty to live to themselves. That Universalists have not misunderstood the apostle is evident from verse 19, where he defines the "ministry of reconciliation," as consisting, in substance, of the great truth, "that God was in Christ reconciling *the world* unto himself." The opinion of Dr. A. Clarke, that "giant in Hebrew and Greek," on the passage under consideration is expressed in the following words,

The *first* position the apostle takes for granted, viz: that Jesus Christ *died for* ALL *mankind*. This no apostolical man, or primitive Christian, ever did doubt, or could doubt." See Com. 2 Cor. v, 15.

But I need not quote the opinions of men. Language more explicit could hardly have been used than inspiration has employed in testifying that Christ died for all men. If you will deny this, you owe it at least to the common sense of mankind to offer your reasons for so doing.

I might offer a remark or two on Eph. 1, 10, and Rev. v, 13, the only remaining passages you quote, but I have already transgressed my limits and must let them pass. Yours respectfully &c.

T. J. SAWYER.

Rev. W. C. BROWNLEE. D. D.

THE DESPAIRER.

We conclude on the first page of the present number, the sketch under the above title, commenced in our last. It professes to be a simple narration of *fact*, and the well known initials of Br. B. B. Hallock, will be a sufficient guarantee for the faithfulness of the picture. Indeed, to those who have been accustomed for a period past, to stop in their journey, and look abroad upon the wide spread scene of desolation caused by the whirlwind of *fanaticism* which has gone over our land, it will appear but a mere transcript of what their eyes have almost daily seen, and their ears have almost daily heard. Many a noble and generous mind has been prostrated, and its possessor plunged into the dark gulph of despair—many a frail creature of earth has been stricken down by its withering blast, and is now frantic with apprehension, (if perchance the feeble thread of life has not already broken asunder,) or may be seen wringing her hands in silent, hopeless agony over the horrible picture of endless wrath and damnation, which some fanatic has portrayed for *her*, if she did not instantly comply with some utter *impossibility*.

We have at this moment in our view, a poor unfortunate female—a *Mother!* separated from her home, the fond embrace of her companion, and her little ones, and an inmate of an *insane hospital!* She had "experienced religion," as the fashionable term is. As is customary in these revival exercises, she was at the first, awfully excited in view of her lost and undone condition. Hell, with all its horrors, was yawning to receive her, but as poor human nature cannot long sustain this extreme of feverish excitement, the storm of apprehension was, after a time, spent. Her connexions and friends began to speak peace to her troubled mind—tell of joys in store for her—of a Savior's love and compassion. The tide of feeling turned—a ray of light broke in—hope—joy soon followed, and she was happy! She attended the preparatory Lecture for the Sacrament, with the view of being propounded for admission into the Church. The preacher addressed the Candidates on the nature of their hopes. Portrayed in vivid colors the exercises of their minds from the first moment of *awakening*, through their season of hopelessness and agony, to the first gleam of hope, and the final consummation of their happiness in the full assurance of acceptance and pardon.

While each heart beat high with joy at their escape from the snares of sin—the curtain was rudely drawn aside, and the whole process shown to be the works of Satan—a "delusion of the evil one!" for the greater part of them at least. Among that portion who had thus been the "sport of devils," in her own estimation, was the unfortunate female in question. Her hopes were blasted! A few short days saw her a raving maniac, and a tenant of the *mad-house*. And this is only a *single instance*, among thousands, from like causes, within a few years past. Hardly an individual but can point to more or less like cases, within his own circle of acquaintance. Lamentations have in truth pervaded our otherwise happy land. But, thank God, a change is manifesting itself. More just and rational views of the character of Deity, and the nature of the worship due unto him from his creature man, are fast spreading through community. Men begin to search the record, with joyful anticipations for their future destiny. The dark cloud of endless misery, which has so long cast its sombre hue over the whole sentient creation, is fast receding before the bright sun of universal life, and peace, and joy. May these life-giving beams continue to extend, until they warm every desponding heart, and carry peace to every troubled bosom, thus consummating the heavenly annunciation, of "Glad tidings of great joy, which SHALL be unto all people." P.

THE CONTROVERSY.

On the second page will be found an article from Br. Morse, in reference to the controversy now pending between him and Rev. Luther Lee, of the Methodist Church. Some explanatory observations may be necessary for many of our readers. Sometime since Mr. Lee and Mr. Morse had an oral religious debate. Each party, or their friends, claimed the victory, which led to some farther propositions between the parties, and after a correspondence of several months, they mutually agreed upon *another* discussion of the subject, *in writing*. This was commenced, as will be seen by the communication on our second page, with the preliminary letter of June 13, 1833, and is now in progress.

In the Christian Advocate and Journal (the methodist paper of this city) of the 6th inst. Mr. Lee has published a *part* of Br. Morse's letter of July 24th, with his reply thereto, omitting the two previous letters, marked in Br. Morse's communication "Letter *one*" and "*two*," and all that part of Br. M.'s communication of July 24, under head of "Letter 3." We have not room now for that portion published in the Advocate and Journal, but readily comply with Br. M's request in giving the suppressed parts an insertion. We had the introductory remarks of the Adv. and Journal, with some observations of our own, prepared to accompany this, but they are crowded by, this week. P.

RELIGIOUS NOTICE

Br. S. J. Hillyer will preach in Williamsburg Wednesday eve. Oct 2d. at Darien Friday eve. the 4th, Long Ridge Sunday 6th, North Salem Friday eve. 8th, Pawlwings Sunday 13ht.

MARRIED,

In this city on Monday morning last, by the Rev. T. J. Sawyer, Mr. George P. Smith, of Lansingburgh, and Miss Sarah Smith, daughter of Allen Smith of this city.

In Philadelphia, on Sunday evening, 15th inst. by Ev. A. C. Thomas, Mr. Oliver P. Waldron and Miss Ann T. Brickill, all of that city.

☞Extra Sheet.☜

We propose publishing the Appeal of Br. Thomas, inserted in our columns to day, in an *Extra Sheet*, for GRATUITOUS DISTRIBUTION. We are induced to do this, for two reasons. 1st, Because the circulation of the Messenger is comparatively limited here, being only between five and six hundred copies taken in the city, and 2d, Because the columns of limitarian journals are generally effectually closed against every thing of this kind; leaving this, therefore, the only medium of getting grievances before the public. Indeed, one might reasonably conclude, in the case in question, that they prided themselves on this very point, that they could pledge themselves, and forfeit those pledges at pleasure, and follow it with personal abuse. too, and still rest secure in the reflection, that by closing their own columns, but a small part of the community would be likely to see more than one side of the picture. We hope, therefore, that every one of our subscribers, interested in exposing "spiritual wickedness in high places," will call at the office and obtain supplies of the Extras, and promptly aid us in laying the transaction before the inhabitants of this city. We would be glad if every respectable house in the city could be furnished with a copy. There are those, we doubt not in the least, who will treat the measure with *scorn* and *contempt*, and who will even almost wish that the days of "*green-wood*" *sacrifices* were revived; but then again there are others who will thank us for the course, and ably sustain us in this attempt to lay open to public view the conduct of men making high pretensions to piety and religion. P.

An Appeal to the Public.

For I beheld and there was no man; even among them, and there was no counsellor; that when I asked of them could answer a word. Behold they are all vanity—their works are nothing.—Isa xli. 28, 29.

However painful the task may be, to expose the duplicity, craft, and anti-christian conduct of men reputed for piety—and however heartily we may deplore the necessity for such exposure,—still, a sense of duty to myself, to the denomination of which I am a member, to the Master of assemblies, and to community at large, imperiously requires, that a faithful statement of the conduct of the Editors of the N. Y. Christian Intelligencer should be laid before the public. I choose to perform my duty in this matter in the form of an Appeal.

I recently wrote and published a pamphlet of 12 pages, containing, and entitled, "213 Questions without answers." It appears that a copy thereof was enclosed in a letter, addressed to the Editors above mentioned, accompanied by a respectful request that the Questions might receive suitable replies. The following *editorial* article appeared in the "Intelligencer" of August 3d:—

"*To Correspondents.* The letter of I. has been received, with the pamphlet enclosed—and in reply, we hereby offer I. to write 213 answers to A. C. T's 213 questions, if he will pay for the printing of them; and we also assure him that they shall be short, pithy, and scriptural."

Being in New-York the following week, and being shown the above paragraph, I called at the Intelligencer office—made myself known as the author of the pamphlet—offered to publish the 213 answers in the columns of the Christian Messenger—and claimed the fulfilment of their public pledge. I was told, in reply, that my proposal would be made known to the writer of the pledge. His name was asked for, and refused, connected with the information, that *the paper had fifteen or twenty editors*. I offered to pay a fair consideration for the insertion of the 213 Questions in the columns of the Intelligencer. The offer was instantly rejected—they would not publish the Questions on *any* terms. This was on Friday, Aug. 9.

On Saturday afternoon, I called again, according to promise; but the writer of the pledge had not yet been seen.

On Monday afternoon, called again, and was in-

formed that the 213 answers would be furnished only on condition that they should be printed in pamphlet form. I pledged myself to have 1000 copies printed and circulated immediately on reception of the answers in MS—desiring at the same time, that the answers should be the strongest that could be given—that I wished the editors to unite in framing them—and that I should consider them as coming out under the sanction of the Editors of the Christian Intelligencer.

Having to leave New York on Tuesday, it was agreed that P. Price, publisher of the Messenger, (who was then present) should call on Tuesday afternoon, to ascertain when the answers would be furnished. Agreeably to this arrangement, Br. Price, accompanied by Br. Boyden, called at the Intelligencer office, and was informed, that the writer of the *editorial pledge* ☞ declined giving the answers, *in toto*. On desiring the reason, it was replied, "*The writer says, on sitting down to a re-examination of the Questions, he finds some of them will require a column, or nearly so. to answer them, and he cannot attend to them; and for this reason he declines.*" To this Br. Price observed, "This decision then settles the business wholly." The answer was given, "*Yes, he declines having any thing further to do with it.*"

☞ "I beheld, and there was no man; even among them, and there was no counsellor, that when I asked of them could answer a word. Behold, they are all vanity—their works are nothing." ☜

A brief statement of the above circumstances, with a few remarks, was published in the Christian Messenger of Aug. 17. And here, excepting perhaps an additional word of comment, we should have allowed the matter to rest, had the Editors of the Christian Intelligencer evinced a becoming spirit on the occasion. We have for a long time strongly suspected that they felt their inability successfully to oppose the doctrine of Universalism.—Their refusal to fulfil their public pledge, has produced a settled conviction that this is the fact. But that they would resort to defamation of character, and to the use of the most opprobrious epithets in the vocabulary of vulgarisms, in order to lower an opponent in public opinion—is something that we could not believe, until we saw the following article in the editorial columns of the Intelligencer of Aug. 24.

"THE 213 QUESTIONS.

"We cannot inflict upon the christian ears of our readers, the 213 questions of the Unitarian Universalists. There is no difficulty in answering every one of them. They are the production of a weak mind, but of a heart gigantic in wickedness! He who could pen these questions has no faith in divine revelation: no accurate conceptions of the Almighty; no regard whatever to his holy and most venerable attributes; no just nor accurate idea of the nature of sin; no veneration for the Gospel plan of redemption: he mocks the holy Redeemer: and spurns, with contempt, the belief of his vicarious atonement. The writer of them demonstrates himself to be a cold blooded infidel: exceeding in his ribaldry and contempt of Christianity, all the disciples of the *Paine* school. He has a match for his blasphemy, and hatred of God's holy word, only in *the person* of the man (we will not pollute our pages with his name,) who wrote the pitiful libel on God, and on human nature, call "*ecce homo!*

We are guided solely by respect to the Christian feelings of our readers. We cannot justify ourselves by exhibiting the most revolting blasphemy simply for the purpose of exhibiting the gospel antidote! We cannot put in our columns, the essence of silliness and wickedness merely for the purpose of playing off the edge of the "Jerusalem blade" of the Holy Word! We said *silliness*—for one of the questions is actually this—"*If there be a personal devil, who made him?*" The author of this foolish question has not the wit, nor even the common sense to distinguish between the *essence* & *faculties* of a person, whom God made; and the *wicked actings* of that person, which it puts forth in voluntary wickedness. With such silliness who can consent to enter the arena in conflict? Again, his 57th question ridicules the idea of *sin being infinite*. Now did he possess any accurate views of philosophy and truth, he might know that sin is called infinite in the Bible, (see Job 22, 5,) because it is an evil in the human soul, that has a self perpetuating power. The sinner dying impenitent, goes on to sin, and sin for ever and ever; hating God, and for ever hating him! For neither God, nor himself, nor any one ever will change his moral character and actings. Hence as the evil *for ever* perpetuates itself, even as long as God is holy and pure; SO HE KEEPS HIMSELF OUT OF GOD'S PRESENCE; that is to say, OUT OF HEAVEN FOR EVER & EVER, even as long as God is pure and just: that is throughout all possible duration! And this can be affirmed of "one sin" and of "a million" of self perpetuating sins. Hence they are *infinite*, in the strictest scriptural, and philosophical sense. Here is another specimen of this half witted infidel: *Question* 14, "*If God hates the sinner, does the sinner do wrong in hating God?*" That is to say, "If spotless VIRTUE hates attrocious VICE; does AN ATROCIOUSLY VICIOUS MAN DO WRONG IN HATING VIRTUE?" With such contemptible silliness, what man of character will enter the lists of controversy? Take another specimen of his sheer ignorance, and malignity against the atonement of our redeemer. *Question* 32, "*If a God all mercy be a God unjust, would not a God all justice be a God unmerciful?*" That is, a magistrate who is "all justice," orders the company of condemned pirates who had murdered hundreds, and who declare that if at liberty, they would hasten to murder as many more, to be forthwith executed. Therefore he is an *unmerciful judge!* But there is not silliness merely in this question; there is a virulent opposition to our Lord's atonement in it. God our Father, in his love sent his only Son to satisfy divine justice for his people. Through this channel God glorifies his purity and justice; and displays at the same time his boundless mercy, to his church. All this is overlooked contemptuously by this Unitarian Universalist!

From this specimen, our readers must see that we cannot spread out on our pages, the blasphemy and revolting moral pollution of his "213 *Questions*" merely to show how very easily they can be answered. What parent would hire half a dozen ruffians to stand up in the circle of his family and permit them to swear for half an hour; and utter all the blasphemies they could conceive; merely that the father might have an opportunity of pronouncing the third commandment; or of reading aloud "the swearer's prayer," after they had done!! Surely the safest way would be, to read the third commandment and the swearer's prayer again and again to his children: and dispense with the revolting blasphemy of the *hired blasphemers;* who would only pollute his children's minds."

The foregoing article would not be deemed worthy a reply, were it not for the following reasons: 1st. It appeared as an *editorial* production, in the columns of an acknowledged organ of the German Reformed Church, viz. the "Christian Intelligencer." And 2d. I am desirous of removing any injurious impression, in relation to my character, that may have been made on the public mind. I am aware that I could procure ample redress by appealing to the laws of the land, which are made for "the lawless and the disobedient;" but I prefer an appeal to the righteous judgment of a Christian community. Let prejudice, then, be laid aside—let the reader calmly set himself down, and, in a spirit of candor and Christian feeling, peruse the following

FRIENDLY LETTER,

To the Editors of the "Christian Intelligencer."

Brethren—You have seen proper, in a recent number of your paper, to utter certain "hard speeches" against the moral and christian character of the undersigned—and to "speak evil of things you understand not," as touching the doctrine of which he is a public advocate. It is not necessary for me to relate to you the particular circumstances which induced you to publish the article, on which I propose offering a word of comment in this friendly letter. You are better judges of your own feelings and motives than I can possibly be; and I will venture to assure you, that, notwithstanding the severe and unmerited language you have used in relation to me, I cherish toward you none other than the emotions of love mingled with sorrow. *Love*—because you are children of our heavenly Father; and *sorrow*, because you have allowed yourselves to be overcome by the spirit of "another gospel." I am sure you cannot feel comfortably under the influence of that spirit—and I am desirous, therefore, of setting in order before your eyes, the way of the transgressor, in which you have trodden.

And I begin by noticing the hard speeches you have uttered against a fellow traveller to eternity, whose face you have never seen in the flesh, and with whose character you cannot be acquainted. You say that I have "*a heart gigantic in wickedness;*" that I am "*a cold blooded*" and "*half witted Infidel;*" that I have "*no faith in Divine revelation;*" and, by obvious implication, that I am a "*hired blasphemer.*"

Now, brethren, look at these charges—remember that you have ventured to make them against a fellow mortal—imagine that you hear Paul reasoning of "*righteousness, temperance, and a judgment to come*"—and do you not tremble? How do you reconcile your conduct with what conscience may have to say about usurping the throne of God, and judging *the heart?* "Judge not, lest ye be judged." Surely, brethren, surely you were tempted in an evil hour.

But I will let this matter pass, at least for the present. I am willing to make even more than a reasonable allowance, for the excited state of feeling, in which you must have penned the cited charges. I say *must*, for bad as I believe the spirit of your doctrine to be, I cannot believe that you *soberly* approve your own conduct in this matter. I do not believe you will do so again.

In relation to the "213 Questions," you have said certain things, which, for your own credit, I hope you will retract, or attempt to prove. You say, the questions are "the essence of silliness and wickedness,"—you speak of their "revolting blasphemy," "revolting moral pollution," "contemptible silliness," &c.

Now it appears to me that you wrote thus much about the questions, in a state of excitement.—When men have their wits about them, as the saying is, and when they are determined to pursue a straight forward course, they seldom contradict themselves. How comes it that you publicly pledged yourselves to furnish 213 "short, pithy and scriptural" answers to the "essence of silliness and wickedness," &c.? How comes it that you did not perceive "the revolting blasphemy and moral pollution" of the questions, until the fulfilment of your PUBLIC PLEDGE was demanded? How comes it that you declined fulfilling your pledge, because some of the "contemptibly silly" questions would "require a column, or nearly so," of an imperial folio paper, to answer them. And yet you say, "there is no difficulty in answering every one of them!" Brethren, in following you up in the crooked path you have marked out for your own feet, I am compelled to put these *crooked* queries, and you must furnish some very *straight* answers, else you will not appear well before the public.

You say, in the commencement of your article, "We cannot inflict upon the christian ears of our readers, the 213 Questions of the Unitarian Universalists." Very well. I thought this matter was perfectly understood between us, when I offered to pay for their insertion in your columns, and your agent *instantly refused to comply on any terms.* But you should not forget, that I offered to insert your 213 Answers in the "Christian Messenger," without charge; and moreover, that I pledged myself to publish 1000 copies in pamphlet form,

and circulate them immediately. All, therefore, that you say about "inflicting" the questions on "the christian ears" of your readers, is entirely out of place.

There is another thing that I hope will not be overlooked. Had you no suspicion that, in publishing the article in review, you were "inflicting" on the "christian ears"; of your readers a little of the "old leaven of malice and wickedness?" I beg of you to peruse what you have written, and to inquire how much it contains of the "CHARITY that *thinketh no evil; is not easily provoked; doth not behave itself unseemly*," &c. But it seems, that, not withstanding the "silliness," "blasphemy," and "moral pollution" of the Questions, you were disposed to "inflict" a few of them on the "christian ears" of your readers. You quote Question 88, as being *peculiarly silly*. You saw plainly that it would not do to quote the questions with which it stands in connexion—and therefore wisely concluded not to touch the "unclean thing." But I am disposed to lay the matter before you again, now that you have become somewhat cool—believing that your former opinion will be resumed, viz: that "some of them will require a column, or nearly so, to answer them." Here are the questions, in their proper order:

"88. If there be a personal Devil, who made him?

89. Can there be any such thing as sin in heaven?

90. If there ever *was* sin in heaven, may not sin be committed there again?

91. If an angel of light became a devil, was not Paul in error, when he said, "Satan is transformed into an angel of light?" 2 Cor. xi, 14.

92. As sin pre-supposes temptation of some sort, who tempted a holy angel to sin?

93. If an *angel* could sin without a Devil to tempt him, may *we* not sin without a Devil to tempt *us?*

94. If a holy angel was tempted to sin by surrounding evil, is heaven a holy place?

95. If an angel was tempted by evil passions, could he have been *holy*?

96. If an angel became a Devil by sinning, was Adam's the *original* sin?"

Here, brethren, you have at one view all the questions that relate to "a personal devil." Allowing all the distinction you desire to be observed between "the *essence* and *faculties* of a person whom God made, and the *wicked actings* of that person, which it puts forth in voluntary wickedness," still the obvious answers to the above "*silly*" questions stare you in the face. I hope you will look at them again.

Your remarks on the infinity of sin, in reply to Question 57, will be *better understood*, perhaps, by bringing into view all the questions that relate to this point. Here they are:

"55. As man is a finite being, can he commit an infinite sin?

56. If man cannot commit an infinite sin, can he deserve endless punishment?

57. If one sin be infinite, can a million be any more?

58. If *one* sin be *not* infinite, can a million sins amount to an infinite sin?

59. If sin be infinite, can one sin be greater than another?

60. If sin be infinite, can it be true that, "Where sin abounded, grace did *much more* abound?" Rom. v, 20.

61. If sin be infinite, can it ever be finished or brought to an end?

62. If *one* sin deserves an eternity of punishment, how much punishment will *ten* sins deserve?"

Now, brethren, let me ask you why you failed to give your readers an opportunity to know the *grounds* on which I questioned the infinity of sin? A passage in a certain old fashioned book, lays it down as a rule, that we should do unto others as we would have them do unto us, in an interchange of circumstances. "Cold blooded infidel" as you declare I am, I can not find it in my heart, "gigantic" as you say it is "in wickedness," to treat you as badly as you have treated me, in the matter before us. I will state the whole strength of your argument.

1st. You say that "sin is called infinite in the Bible." The passage to which you refer, is as follows: "Is not thy wickedness great? and thine iniquities infinite?" Job xxii, 5. Now, brethren, are you sure that Eliphaz spoke the truth, in this interrogative affirmation? When you have leisure, I hope you will read Job xlii, 7. Meanwhile, let me ask you, whether you are sure that you understand the passage? You will please observe that, in the first clause of the text, the *opinion of Eliphaz* concerning the nature of Job's wickedness, is referred to. "Is not thy wickedness *great?*" In the latter clause, the *number* of his sins is the point in question—for the *plural* is used. "And thy *iniquities* [not iniquity] infinite?" You at once perceive that, strictly speaking, infinity defies enumeration—and the very fact that the plural is used, destroys whatever force you may have given to the question of Eliphaz the Temonite. In Nahum iii, 9, we read as follows: "Ethiopia and Egypt were her strength, and it was *infinite*; yet she was carried away, she went into captivity." I beg of you to ask yourselves, whether the "strength" of "populous No" was strictly infinite, and whether you would not do well to examine the passage in Job.

2. You affirm that "sin has a self-perpetuating power;" that "the sinner dying impenitent, goes on to sin, and sin forever and ever." Would it not be well for you to state the *proof* of these positions? If you convince me that any one will eternally sin, I will acknowledge that he will be eternally miserable. Or if you will convince me that sin "has [an eternally] self-perpetuating power," then I will in truth become a "cold blooded infidel," and deny that Christ shall "finish transgression and make an end of sins." And I will also deny, that "where sin abounded, grace did *much more abound.*" I leave you to settle this matter with the Bible. And let me caution you against consulting Heb. ii, 14, and 1 John iii, 8.

But you found "another specimen of this half witted infidel," in Q. 14. "If God hates the sinner, does the sinner do wrong in hating God?" Now, brethren, I will not charge you with being "half-witted"—for your remarks on this question plainly evince not a little craft. You give the following shape to my question: "If spotless VIRTUE hates atrocious VICE; does AN ATROCIOUSLY VICIOUS MAN DO WRONG IN HATING VIRTUE?" And you add, "with such contemptible *silliness*, what man of character (?) will enter the lists of controversy?" I wish you to keep in remembrance, that you PUBLICLY PLEDGED yourselves to "enter the lists of controversy" "with such contemptible silliness"—and that you were once of opinion that it would require "a column, or nearly so," to answer some of these *contemptibly silly* questions. And surely, in noticing the pamphlet in your columns, you would not select the questions that you thought you could most easily answer!

Now, brethren, look at Q. 14, compare it with the shape you have given it—and then ask yourselves whether you have treated the subject fairly? "If God hates the *sinner*"—not, "If God hates *sin*," &c. Do you believe that God hates the *sinner?* Answer the question fairly. Do you believe that God hates his *enemies?* If you say he does, I ask you why *we* are required to love *our* enemies? If God *loves* his *friends*, and *hates* his *enemies*, is he any *better* than the sinner? I wish you to remember, that there is such a word as *blasphemy!*—Allow me to quote a few of the questions on this point.

"1. As we are required to love our enemies, may we not safely infer that God loves *His* enemies?

3. If God loves His enemies, will he punish them more than will be for their good?

3. Would endless punishment be for the good of any being?

4. As God loves His *friends*, if he loves His *enemies* also, are not all mankind the objects of His love?

5. If God loves those only who love *Him*, what better is he than the sinner? Luke vi, 32, 33.

8. As we are forbidden to be overcome of evil, can we safely suppose that *God* will be overcome of evil?

9. Would not the infliction of endless punishment, prove that God *had* been overcome of evil?

10. If man does wrong in returning evil for evil, would not God do wrong were he to do the same?

11. Would not endless punishment be the return of evil for evil?

12. As we are commanded to "overcome evil with good," may we not safely infer that God will do the same?

13. Would the infliction of endless punishment be overcoming evil with good?

14. If God hates the sinner, does the sinner do wrong in hating *Him?*"

You refer to only one more of the questions. In order to give you another opportunity to see this question in the connexion in which it stands, I will cite the following:

"23. Can that be *just* which is not *merciful?*

24. Do not cruelty and injustice go hand in hand?

25. Can that be merciful which is not just?

26. Does Divine justice demand the infliction of pain from which mercy recoils?

27. Does Divine mercy require any thing that justice refuses to grant?

28. If the demands of Divine justice are opposed to the requirements of mercy, is not God divided against Himself?

29. If the requirements of the *mercy*, are opposed to the demands of the *justice* of God, can His kingdom stand? Mark iii, 24.

30. If the justice and mercy of God are in any way opposed, do they "keep the unity of the spirit in the bonds of peace?"

31. If justice and mercy are opposed in their requirements, can Deity be "a just God *and* a Saviour? Isa. xlv, 21.

32. If "a God all mercy is a God unjust," would not a God all justice be a God unmerciful?

33. Is there any such thing in God as unjust mercy, or unmerciful justice?

34. Is there any such thing in God as just cruelty or merciful injustice?"

Brethren, I ask you, as a particular favor, to point out the question in which any "malignity against the atonement of our Redeemer" is manifested. Surely, brethren, surely you did not mean to say, that there is any *malignity* in the questions. If you did mean to say so, it is your duty to come out, and in a friendly spirit, endeavor to convince me of my error. Remember, that you are Christians, by profession—and that you should be Christians in practice also. For "faith without works is dead, being alone."

And this thought naturally brings with it a train of reflection, as to the *spirit* of your article. Do you remember the occasion on which the blessed Jesus said, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of"? I am sorry, for your own sakes, and for the credit of religion, that you have so widely departed from the benign and heavenly principles that dwelt in the bosom of the Master. Even allowing that in requiring of you the fulfilment of your VOLUNTARY PUBLIC PLEDGE,—and in offering to comply with *your own conditions*—I say, even allowing that in so doing, I was guilty of a wrong, (which you will not pretend,) were you justified in treating me as you did? "Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good." "Bless and curse not." Such are the instructions of the Divine testimony; and it is in vain that you say, "Lord, Lord," if you do not obey him.

But I have done, at least for the present. I have written much more than I first intended—but the subject is an important one, and I could not in conscience say less than I have said. You will please accept the unfeigned assurance, that although we differ in matters of faith, I love you, and humbly I pray, that the Master whom we profess to serve, will guide us safely through the devious windings of this mortal life, and at last save us with an everlasting salvation.

ABEL C. THOMAS.

N. B. If you should feel disposed to reply to this friendly letter, we will cheerfully insert your article in the columns of the "Christian Messenger."

A. C. T.

P. PRICE, PRINTER,
Nos. 2 and 3 Marble Buildings, Chatham-Square, where JOB PRINTING will be neatly executed, on reasonable terms. Orders solicited.